Project File Number PWE30001 Date 1/6/E3

PHILIP MORRIS
MANUFACTURING SERVICES
PROJECT

Brand Marlboro KS Reg. - Mid East.
Factory M/C - Maker #201
Date Manuf. 1/5/E3
Project Title Evaluation Of Plug Wrap Change Effect On Tar Delivery
Representative Monitoring Test WT. [illegible]/E.W. Weston/E.M.W[illegible]
Project Coordinator C.F. Vesley

Coordination Departments	Coordinator	Date Submitted	Est. Completion Date
			1/6/E3
Mfg. Svcs. Lab.	C.F. Vesley	1/6/E3	1/10/E3 ✓
Q.A. Analytical	M.S. Pope	1/6/E3	1/10/E3 ✓
R&D Analytical	F.A. Spruill	1/6/E3	

Estimated Completion Date (Total) 1/10/E3
Requested Completion Date 1/10/E3
Requestor/Originator J.B. Easley
Project Objectives: Mfg. Svcs Lab: Dilution-Study of each sample. Analytical/Smoking & Physicals, Q.A. Analytical: FTC Analytical/Smoking & Physicals. R&D Analytical: ISC Analytical/Smoking & Physicals. Sample Description: See Attachment.
Mfg. Svcs. Management Approval
Priority (Circle one of the following) [✓ 1] 2 3 4 5

DESCRIPTION OF PRIORITIES

1. TOP PRIORITY PROJECT
   - Directives from Top Management
   - Critical Quality Problem
   - Critical Production Problem
2. HIGH PRIORITY PROJECT
   If not completed on schedule will affect required production changes or target dates.
3. STANDARD PRIORITY PROJECT
   Should be completed on schedule, but some delay not critical.
4. ROUTINE PRIORITY PROJECT
   Some slippage of completion date will not affect quality or production.
5. LOW PRIORITY PROJECT
   Would be nice to have complete.

Marlboro K.S. Reg.-Mid East. Date Mfr: 1/5/83
M/C-Maker #2 D1 Evaluation Of Plug Wrap
Change Effect On Tar Delivery.

#1	Control: Ec. 612 PW 6.0 cm AP TP 12 sec/2.0% Citrate CP. (10-17% Dil.)
#1	Test: 17 M1 PW 6.0 cm AP TP 12 sec/2.0% Citrate CP
#2	Test: 33 M1 PW 6.0 cm AP TP 12 sec/2.0% Citrate CP

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/zswy0004

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
#1 Control: Ec612 P.W 6.0 ΔP TP 12 sec (2.0 nitrate) CP		13	14	
		11	13	
		10	12	
		14	12	
		9	11	
		8	12	
		12	12	
		9	10	
		12	11	
		12	14	
		12	13	
		14	10	
		11	13	
		12	12	
		12	12	
		10	13	
		10	10	
		10	11	
		10	10	
		9	12	
		11	12	
		13	11	
		11	13	
		14	14	
		10	12	
	[illegible]	11.16	11.96	11.56
	[illegible]	1.675	1.24	1.51

[illegible]
[illegible] Method # [illegible] Evaluation of [illegible]
Effect on [illegible]

Sample

	Target	[illegible] % Front	[illegible] % Back	Total
#1 TEST: 17ml P.W 6.0 cm AP TP 12 sec (20% citric) CP		14	14	
		14	16	
		18	17	
		16	11	
		15	14	
		18	13	
		18	11	
		17	10	
		16	15	
		18	17	
		18	17	
		16	14	
		18	16	
		16	16	
		17	17	
		18	15	
		17	14	
		18	14	
		15	12	
		18	14	
		18	15	
		16	13	
		15	16	
		17	15	
		16	14	
[illegible]		16.68	14.4	15.54
[illegible]		1.35	1.96	2.02

[illegible]

[illegible] change

[illegible]

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
#2 Test: w/33ml P.W		19	18	
6.0cm ΔP TP		18	19	
12sec (2070 cc/mte) CP		18	17	
		20	21	
		17	18	
		22	18	
		19	18	
		16	19	
		19	19	
		20	19	
		19	21	
		18	22	
		22	17	
		19	21	
		19	16	
		19	22	
		22	21	
		21	20	
		21	20	
		21	18	
		19	20	
		22	18	
		20	21	
		19	20	
		18	18	
	[illegible]	19.48	19.24	19.36
	[illegible]	1.61	1.64	1.61

Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/zswy0004